DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 578 CE 058 904

AUTHOR Woloszyk, Carl A.
TITLE Influences on Students Selecting Cooperative Education Programs in Michigan High Schools. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 20 Jun 91
NOTE 135p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Education; Decision Making; *Enrollment Influences; Family Influence; Goal Orientation; High Schools; Instructor Coordinators; Parent Influence; Publicity; Public Relations; Racial Differences; Sex Differences; State Surveys; *Student Educational Objectives; Student Interests; Teacher Influence
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan

ABSTRACT

Factors influencing the decision of high school students to enroll in cooperative education programs were investigated in a survey. The stratified random sample consisted of 275 high school students currently enrolled in cooperative education programs in five different types of communities throughout Michigan. The survey questionnaire included 8 demographic questions and 35 items dealing with reasons for enrolling in cooperative education. Students indicated their agreement or disagreement with selected people as influences, promotional strategies, and educational and personal reasons for enrolling in a cooperative education program. A chi-square test for independence identified the degree to which type of community, race, and sex affected student enrollment decisions. The most important people who influenced the students' decisions to enroll in cooperative education were, in order of importance, friends, co-op coordinator, and parent(s)/guardian(s). The single most important promotional strategy was a meeting with the co-op coordinator. Educational goals and personal reasons were clearly identified as the predominant influencing factors for students selecting cooperative education programs. The following appendixes amount to over 90 percent of the report: (1) the survey instrument; (2) analysis of educational and personal influences by community and type of influence; (3) analysis of nonwhite and white students by type of influence; and (4) analysis of male and female students by type of influence. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337578

Influences on Students Selecting Cooperative Education Programs in Michigan High Schools

Final Report
June 20, 1991

Researcher

Carl A. Woloszyk, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Western Michigan University
Department of Consumer Resources and Technology

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Woloszyk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Funded by

Western Michigan University: College of Education
Research Mini-Grant Award Program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Influences on Students Selecting Cooperative Education Programs in Michigan High Schools

Carl A. Woloszyk, Ph.D.
Department of Consumer Resources and Technology
Western Michigan University

Abstract

During the 1990-91 school year, a study was funded through theWestern Michigan University, College of Education research mini-grant program with assistance of the Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service to study influencing factors in the decision of high school students to enroll in cooperative education programs.

The study had five major purposes:

1. identify the characteristics of current cooperative education enrollees
2. determine the significant people who influenced students to select a cooperative education program
3. determine the significant promotional materials and strategies which influenced students to select a cooperative education program
4. determine the educational goals and personal reasons identified by students for enrolling in a cooperative education program
5. provide recommendations for a recruitment strategy regarding cooperative education programs in Michigan.

Through the use of a stratified random sample of high schools in five different types of communities throughout the state of Michigan (metropolitan core cities, cities, towns, urban fringe, and rural), 480 students currently enrolled in cooperative education programs were surveyed.

The survey instrument was 43-item questionnaire with a total of 8 demographic questions and 35 items dealing with their reasons for enrolling in cooperative education. Students indicated their agreement or disagreement on selected people influences, promotional strategies, and educational and personal reasons for enrolling in a cooperative education program.

Summative data was collected and a chi-square test for independence was used to identify the degree that type of community, race, and sex affected student enrollment decisions.

Acknowledgements

The writer wishes to acknowledge the help and assistance of several individuals without whose help and valuable input this study would not have been made possible. Mr. Tom Benton, vocational education consultant, Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service piloted tested the initial survey instrument at a comprehensive high school and provided periodic feedback and support throughout the study.

Students from Corunna High School, Kalamazoo Loy-Norrix High School and Calhoun Area Vocational Center are thanked for their initial review and comments, which helped to revise and improve the final instrument.

Lastly, the help and cooperation from the instructors, who coordinated the data collection and the cooperative education students, who completed the final survey from the following Michigan high schools is also sincerely appreciated:

Ms. Tina Coleman	Detroit Mumford High School
Mr. Harrison Duke	Detroit Mumford High School
Mr. Frank Garzelloni	Muskegon High School
Ms. Marsha Braun	Swartz Creek High School
Mr. Richard Caton	Farmington Senior High School
Mr. Al Gable	Port Huron Northern High School
Mr. Jim O'Brien	Mount Clemens High School
Ms. Rhea Scoggin	Howell High School
Ms. Violet Seymour	Clare High School
Mr. Ray Van Horn	Tawas Area High School
Ms. Sally Barnett	New Haven High School
Ms. Paulette Bird	Meridian High School
Ms. Jackie Scheller	Hartland High School

Table of Contents

Introduction page 1

Purposes page 2

Methodology page 2

Limitations page 3

Results page 4

Discussion page 10

Recommendations page 12

Bibliography page 12

Tables

Table 1: Demographics of Respondents to the Cooperative Education Student Survey
Table 2: Influences of People on Student Enrollment Decisions
Table 3: Employer Influence by Community Type
Table 4: Coordinator Influence by Community Type
Table 5: Influences of Promotional Materials and Strategies on Student Enrollment Decisions
Table 6: Interview with Coordinator by Community Type
Table 7: Influences of Educational Goals and Personal Reasons on Student Enrollment Decisions

Appendices

Appendix A: Pilot Survey, Final Survey Instrument and Related Correspondence
Appendix B: Analysis of Educational and Personal Influences by Community and Type of Influence
Appendix C: Analysis of Non-White and White Students by Type of Influence
Appendix D: Analysis of Male and Female Students by Type of Influence

Influences on Students Selecting Cooperative Education Programs in Michigan High Schools

Introduction

More and more students are working for pay while enrolled in high school. Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) analyzed government figures from 1947 to 1980 for 16 and 17 year olds who were attending high school. The labor force participation rate (population who are employed or looking for work at a given point in time) for boys rose from 27 to 44 percent and for girls from 17 to 41 percent. The rates for cumulative work experience are higher. Data from the 1980 High School and Beyond Survey revealed that 80 to 90 percent of high school students had some kind of work experience by the time they graduated (Lewin-Epstein, 1981). Because of the lower birth rates of the 1960's and 1970's there is a relative scarcity of young workers. A rising trend in student employment is likely to continue because job opportunities for students in their teens will become more plentiful and more lucrative.

Continued learning at work is increasingly required of many adult workers, but most student jobs are not designed or chosen to provide practice in learning at work. Because increasing numbers of students are holding jobs while in high school, there is a growing opportunity to use work experience in a deliberate way to promote the acquisition of knowledge and skills. Teamwork, practical problem-solving, interpersonal skills and a positive work ethic can effectively be developed in school-based work experience programs.

One of the most successful school-based programs is vocational cooperative education. Vocational cooperative education is a structured school supervised program in which periods of study alternate with periods of related work experience. At the secondary level students usually attend classes for part of the school day and work part time in the afternoon or evening. Training agreements and plans are developed by school officials in conjunction with employers to help insure that the in-school vocational instruction is coordinated with the on-the-job training experience.

Because cooperative education relates school instruction to activities in the workplace it has been found to motivate some students (Herrnstadt, Horowitz, and Sum, 1979). The Committee for Economic Development (1985), which was critical of high school vocational education, nevertheless endorsed the idea of vocational cooperative education.

While more students are working, participation in school-based vocational cooperative education programs is declining both nationally and statewide. In Michigan the number of vocational cooperative education students has declined steadily from 14,500 in 1983 to 13,200 in 1989, or a 9.3 percent decline in enrollment (Benton,1990). In short it appears that students are getting more work experience generally, but less of it that is explicitly designed to promote learning. Educational policy should try to promote school supervised programs that support student educational objectives.

Purposes

This study has been funded by the Western Michigan University, College of Education research mini-grant program with assistance provided by the Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service from May 1, 1990-April 1991. The study had five major purposes:

- identify the characteristics of current cooperative education enrollees
- determine the significant people who influenced students to select a cooperative education program
- determine the significant promotional materials and strategies which influenced students to select a cooperative education program
- determine the educational goals and personal reasons identified by the students for enrolling in a cooperative education program
- provide recommendations for a recruitment strategy regarding cooperative education programs in Michigan

Methodology

Only high schools and area vocational centers with vocational education cooperative education programs approved and funded by the Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service were included in this study. During May of1990, a sample cooperative education student survey instrument was pilot-tested in two comprehensive high schools and one area vocational center. The responses were reviewed, analyzed, and the final instrument was revised by adding additional items and clarifying existing ones for ease of understanding and completion.

Using a listing of Michigan School Districts Classified by Major Community Type Served, five separate classifications for individual high schools were identified for inclusion in the study. The high schools and community types selected included the following 1) metropolitan core cities, 2) cities, 3) towns, 4) urban fringe, and 5) rural.

Metropolitan core high schools were identified, if they were located in a central city of a Michigan Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. City high schools were identified as being in communities of a population of 10,000 or more and not classified as a Metropolitan Core City or Urban Fringe area. High schools in towns were identified, if they had a population of 2,500 to 9,999. Urban fringe high schools were classified as urban fringe, regardless of their size,if they meet at least one of the following criteria: a) the mailing address of the community is a Metropolitan Core City or a City b) the community was within ten miles of the center of a Metropolitan Core City; or 3) the community was within five miles of the center of a city. Rural high schools were identified as rural if they were located in a population of less than 2,500.

Using a December 15,1989 (X-1015) Summary Listing of Approved Occupational Area Cooperative Education Enrollments furnished by the Michigan Department of Education, a stratified random sample of each high school/community type was used to identify selected high schools and the number of approved and reported students to be surveyed. A total of 480 survey instruments were sent to all identified high schools. A minimum of 85 student surveys were sent to each classification type. Instructors were asked to survey their students and return the surveys to the principal investigator. The initial pilot and final surveys are found in Appendix A.

The survey instrument contained a total of 43 items and was machine readable. 8 questions on the survey identified demographic characteristics of the respondents and 35 questions related to influences for selecting a cooperative education program. Students were asked to think about their decision to enroll in co-op and to indicate disagreement or agreement with the influence statements on a five-point Lickert scale ranging from 1) "strongly disagree", 2) "disagree" 3)"somewhat agree" 4) "agree" to 5) "strongly agree".

Limitations

Cooperative education enrollment in Michigan is recorded through school districts requesting "added cost" funds through a vocational education categorical in the school state aid act. This reporting understates the actual

number of cooperative education programs and enrollments in high school programs for the following reasons:

1. several Career Education Planning Districts (CEPDs) do not select cooperative education as a "funded program", so districts do not report students on co-op,

2. many reporting school districts will only report a student enrolled in an instructional program, and do not report them on co-op, and;

3. the "added cost" reimbursement factor for cooperative education students is so small that school districts do not bother to report any cooperative education activity.

Therefore, the results are based on a survey of only vocational cooperative education programs reported, approved and funded by the Michigan Department of Education and may not be totally representative of other high school funded, supervised and operated cooperative education programs or other types of work-site based education programs in Michigan secondary schools.

Results

A total of 275 cooperative education students completed and returned the survey for a survey response rate of 57%. The Demographics of Respondents to the Cooperative Education Student Survey are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Demographics of Respondents to the Cooperative Education Student Survey

Gender: 28% Male 67% Female 5% No answer

Present grade in school: 1% 9th 1% 10th 19% 11th 77% 12th 2% HS Grad

G.P.A.: 2% less than 0.9 5% 1.0-1.9 55% 2.0-2.9 28% 3.0-3.5 8% 3.5-4.0

Racial/Ethnic Classification:

2% American Indian or Alaskan Native
2% Asian or Pacific Islander
24% Black not of Hispanic Origin
3% Hispanic
68% White, not of Hispanic Origin

Occupational Area now enrolled in:

40% Business and Office

Hours worked per week:

11% less than 15 hours/week

7%	Health
43%	Home economics-Wage-earning
19%	Marketing
15%	Trade and Industrial

33%	15-19 hours /week
33%	20-24 hours/week
15%	25-29 hours/week
6%	30 or more hours/week

Current hourly wage:

4%	less than $3.49
34%	$3.50-$3.99
30%	$4.00-$4.49
13%	$4.50-$4.99
17%	$5.00 or more

Decision to enroll in cooperative education:

3%	During the ninth grade
15%	During the 10th grade
54%	During the 11th grade
26%	During the 12th grade

Several general findings stand out from analyzing the survey data. They are:

1. **Significant people influencers on student enrollment in cooperative education.** The most important people influencers on the students' decisions to enroll in cooperative education were in order of importance 1) friends, 2) the co-op coordinator and 3) parent(s)/guardian(s). 53% of all the respondents indicated agreement with the statements, "my friends took it", and "my co-op coordinator wanted me to take it", and 50% indicated agreement with the statement "my parents/guardians wanted me to take it". A majority of the students disagreed with the statements that the school counselor, employer, other teachers, brothers/sisters, or other relatives were major influences on their decision to enroll in cooperative education. Table 2 details the Influences of People on Student Enrollment Decisions.

Table 2
Influences of People on Student Enrollment Decisions

Statement	Mean	% in Agreement
My friends took it	2.83	53%
My co-op coordinator suggested it	2.81	53%
My parent(s) wanted me to take it	2.70	50%
My school counselor suggested it	2.42	39%
My employer wanted me to take it	2.13	28%
Other teachers suggested it to me	2.06	24%
My brother(s)/sister(s) took co-op	1.82	18%
Other relatives suggested it to me	1.78	15%

The chi-square test for independence was used to determine if significant statistical differences at the .01 level appeared between 1) type of community, 2) between males and females, (sex) and 3) between white and non-white students (race) and the students' decisions to enroll in cooperative education.

Students in towns were found to be more influenced by their employers to enroll in cooperative education than students in other community types. On the dimension of people influencers significance at the .01 level was reached on the statement "My employer wanted me to take it", with students in towns agreeing with the statement and the other community types disagreeing with the statement. Employer Influence by Community is presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Employer Influence by Community Type

	GROUP					
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural	Town	Urban Fringe	Cities	Metro Core	Row Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
EMPLOYER						
0 Disagree	37	12	47	52	43	191
	82.2	36.4	73.4	69.3	74.1	69.5
1 Agree	8	21	17	23	15	84
	17.8	63.6	26.6	30.7	25.9	30.5
Column Total	45	33	64	75	58	275
	16.4	12.0	23.3	27.3	21.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	21.56918	4	.00024
Likelihood Ratio	20.23428	4	.00045
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.21244	1	.64486

Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.080

Number of Missing Observations: 7

Students in towns and in cities agreed with the statement "My co-op coordinator suggested it to me", as an important people influencer more than the students from other community types. Coordinator Influence by Community Type is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Coordinator Influence by Community Type

COORD by GROUP

COORD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		27	6	35	24	28	120
		58.7	18.2	54.7	32.4	49.1	43.8
1 Agree		19	27	29	50	29	154
		41.3	81.8	45.3	67.6	50.9	56.2
	Column Total	46	33	64	74	57	274
		16.8	12.0	23.4	27.0	20.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.56784	4	.00039
Likelihood Ratio	21.53696	4	.00025
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.46234	1	.49653

Minimum Expected Frequency - 14.453

Number of Missing Observations: 8

No statistically significant differences at the .01 level were found for people influencers on the basis of race. Additionally, no statistically significant differences were found on the people influencers on the basis of sex.

2. **Significant promotional materials and strategies which influenced students to select a cooperative education program.** The single most important promotional strategy identified by the students was a meeting with the co-op coordinator. 55 % of the students agreed with the statement "I had an interview with a co-op coordinator". A majority of students disagreed with all other promotional materials and strategies as having a significant influence on their decision to enroll in a cooperative education program. Table #5 details the Influences of Promotional Materials and Strategies on Student Enrollment Decisions.

Table 5
Influences of Promotional Materials and Strategies
on Student Enrollment Decisions

Statement	Mean	% in Agreement
Interview with a coordinator	2.88	55%
Read a course description	2.30	34%
Read a bulletin board about co-op	2.03	23%
Heard a class presentation by coordinator	1.98	19%
Went to a co-op meeting	1.88	17%
Read a brochure/flyer	1.86	16%
Read about co-op in a school newspaper	1.82	14%
Letter sent to parents	1.80	13%
Saw audio/visual presentation on co-op	1.79	13%
Went on a field trip to learn about co-op	1.70	10%
Heard a radio/TV ad about co-op	1.70	10%

A statistically significant difference at the .01 level was found for rural students on the statement ,"I had an interview with a co-op coordinator". A majority disagreed with this statement as compared with students from other community types who agreed that the interview with the coordinator influenced their decision to enroll in the program. Interview with the Coordinator by Community Type data is presented in Table 6.

Table 6
Interview with the Coordinator By Community Type

	GROUP					
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural	Town	Urban Fringe	Cities	Metro Core	Row Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
INTCOORD						
0 Disagree	33	15	19	35	24	126
	73.3	45.5	29.7	47.3	41.4	46.0
1 Agree	12	18	45	39	34	148
	26.7	54.5	70.3	52.7	58.6	54.0
Column Total	45	33	64	74	58	274
	16.4	12.0	23.4	27.0	21.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.94418	4	.00032
Likelihood Ratio	21.51887	4	.00025
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.62426	1	.01006

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.175

Number of Missing Observations: 8

No statistically significant differences were found for promotional strategies on the basis of sex or race.

3. **Educational goals and personal reasons identified by the students for enrolling in a cooperative education program.** Educational goals and personal reasons were clearly identified as the predominate influencing factors for students selecting cooperative education programs. A majority of the students expressed agreement with all the statements pertaining to educational goals and personal reasons. In only three instances did the students express disagreement with the statement. 80% disagreed with the statement "I wanted to enroll in an easy class; 54% disagreed with the statement "I wanted to get out of school early"; and 51%

disagreed with the statement "I wanted to work in a school supervised training program". Table 7 details the Influences of Educational Goals and Personal Reasons on Student Enrollment Decisions.

Table 7
Influences of Educational Goals and Personal Reasons on Student Enrollment Decisions

Statement	Mean	% in Agreement
I wanted to earn money	4.20	86%
I wanted to enhance job opportunities after graduation	3.95	83%
I wanted to earn school credit	3.81	80%
I wanted to develop self-confidence, discipline and responsibility	3.61	79%
I wanted to acquire vocational skills related to future career	3.55	74%
I wanted to learn more about an occupational area	3.41	72%
I wanted to learn how to apply for, get and keep a job	3.36	71%
I wanted to improve my chances of getting into college	3.32	67%
I wanted to help pay for college expenses	3.30	67%
I wanted to combine class/lab theory with practical job experience	3.25	65%
I wanted to develop problem-solving skills	3.01	62%
I wanted a better job than I could get on my own	2.91	52%
I wanted to work in a school-supervised training program	2.73	49%
I wanted to get out of school early	2.75	46%
I wanted to enroll in an easy class	1.95	20%

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that there are no statistically significant differences on the basis of sex and race when compared to people influencers, promotional strategies, and educational goals on students' decisions to enroll in cooperative education.

When differences do occur in a student's decision to enroll in a cooperative education program, it appears that the type of community, which may be reflective of the prevailing educational values and economic conditions of the area, may be an important influencing factor. However, the type of community as an influencing factor is only in degree not in overall direction of agreement or disagreement among students.

For example, the majority of students from all community types agreed with the statement, "I wanted to combine classroom/laboratory theory with practical work experience", but students from cities and rural communities indicated that this was less important than students from towns, urban fringe, and metropolitan core community types at the .01 level of significance.

Likewise, a majority of students agreed with the statement, "I wanted to develop problem-solving skills", but metropolitan core students agreed with this statement to a greater extent than students from other community types.

Students for all community types agreed with statements relating to the 1) awarding of credit, 2) earning of money, 3) increased job opportunities, 4) helping with college expenses, 5) obtaining a good job, and 6) learning about an occupational area, but for rural students these educational and personal goals were less important than for students from other community types at the .01 level of significance. A complete analysis of the data relating to educational and personal influencers by community type can be found in Appendix B.

No significant differences were observed for educational and personal reasons for enrolling in cooperative education on the basis of race. A complete analysis of the data relating to white and non-white students (race) can be found in Appendix C.

While both males and females agreed with the statements relating to 1) self-confidence, 2) credit, and 3) earning money, a level of significance at the .01 level was found with the males agreeing with these identified educational and personal reasons to a greater degree than the females. A complete analysis of the data relating to educational and personal reasons by sex can be found in Appendix D.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of this study the following conclusions and recommendations are provided:

1. the state Department of Education should share the results of this study with cooperative education practicioners at future seminars, meetings and conferences

2. the state Department of Education should incorporate the results of this study in the design of a marketing and recruitment strategy for expanding vocational cooperative education enrollment

3. marketing strategies should be used by cooperative education practicioners to influence friends and parent(s)/guardians of current students using the co-op coordinator as the central focus of recruitment efforts

3. further research and analysis should be conducted as to the adequacy and appropriateness of current promotional materials and strategies used to influence student selection of cooperative education programs

4. marketing strategies employed at the local and/or state level should incorporate the important educational goals and personal reasons for student selection of cooperative education programs in all recruitment efforts

Bibliography

Benton, T. (1990). Work-Site Based Education in Michigan: A Report on High School Cooperative Education. Lansing, MI: Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service.

Committee for Economic Development (1985). Investing in our children. New York: Committee for Economic Development.

Greenberger, E. and Steinberg, L.D. (1986). When teenagers work. New York: Basic Books.

Herrnstadt, I.L., Horowitz, M.A., and Sum, A. (1979). The transition from school to work: the contribution of cooperative education programs at the secondary level. Boston, MA: Northeastern University, Department of Economics.

Lewin-Epstein, N. (1981). Youth employment during high school. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Appendix A

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION STUDENT SURVEY

We are contacting you, as a student, to ask your help in improving the cooperative education program you are currently taking in high school. By answering a few questions about the reasons you decided to take cooperative education and giving us your opinions, you can help us to make cooperative education programs better for students in the future. We are counting on your help. Thank you very much.

Please answer the questions by putting an "x" in the space next to the answer of YOUR CHOICE or by filling in the space.

#1. What is your sex? _____ Male _____ Female

#2. What is your grade level? _____9th _____10th _____11th _____12th

#3. Please identify yourself as a member of one of the groups of people listed below (Check only ONE):

_____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
_____ Asian or Pacific Islander
_____ Black, not of Hispanic Origin
_____ Hispanic
_____ White, not of Hispanic Origin
_____ Other

#4. Which occupational area are you now enrolled in (Check only ONE):

_____ Agriculture (i.e. Agricultural Mechanics, Horticulture)
_____ Business and Office (i.e. Accounting, Data Processing, Secretarial)
_____ Health (i.e. Dental/Medical Assisting, Health Occupations)
_____ Home Economics-Wage-Earning (i.e. Child Care, Food Management)
_____ Marketing (i.e. Sales, Retailing)
_____ Trade and Industrial (i.e. Auto Mechanics, Electronics, Graphics, Machine Tool, Welding)

#5. About how many hours per week do you work? (Check only ONE):

_____ less than 15 hours/week
_____ 15-19 hours/week
_____ 20-24 hours/week
_____ 25-29 hours/week
_____ 30 or more hours/week

#6 When did you first decide to enroll in cooperative education? (Check only ONE):

_____ during the 8th grade
_____ during the 9th grade
_____ during the 10th grade
_____ during the 11th grade
_____ during the 12th grade

Please answer questions 7, 8, and 9 using the following scale:
CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.

#1. "Not important at all"
#2. "Slightly important"
#3. "Moderately important"
#4. "Important"
#5. "Very Important"

#7. When you decided to enroll in cooperative education, how important were each of the following groups of people in your decision?

a. brothers/sisters	1	2	3	4	5
b. friends who completed or took class	1	2	3	4	5
c. other relatives (aunts,uncles,cousins)	1	2	3	4	5
d. parents/guardians	1	2	3	4	5
e. co-op coordinator	1	2	3	4	5
f. school counselor(s)	1	2	3	4	5
g. school teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5
h. other (please list): _____	1	2	3	4	5

_____

#8. When you decided to enroll in cooperative education, how important were each of the following sources of information above cooperative education in your decision?

a. Audio/visual programs & presentations	1	2	3	4	5
b. Brochures/pamphlets	1	2	3	4	5
c. Bulletin boards	1	2	3	4	5
d. Career Days	1	2	3	4	5
e. Classroom presentation(s) by coordinator	1	2	3	4	5
f. Individual interview with coordinator	1	2	3	4	5
g. Letter sent to parents/guardians	1	2	3	4	5

h. Local community newspapers	1	2	3	4	5
i. Radio or TV ads	1	2	3	4	5
j. School newspaper	1	2	3	4	5
k. Other (Please list) _____	1	2	3	4	5

_____

#9. When you decided to enroll in cooperative education, how important were each of the following <u>reasons or expectations</u> about cooperative education in your decision?

The opportunity to.....

a. acquire vocational & employability skills	1	2	3	4	5
b. combine classroom/laboratory theory with practical work experience	1	2	3	4	5
c. develop problem-solving skills	1	2	3	4	5
d. develop self-confidence, self-discipline, and responsibility	1	2	3	4	5
e. earn academic credit toward graduation	1	2	3	4	5
f. earn money while attending school	1	2	3	4	5
g. enhance job opportunities after graduation	1	2	3	4	5
h. help pay for college expenses	1	2	3	4	5
i. learn more about the occupational area	1	2	3	4	5
j. work in a school-supervised training program	1	2	3	4	5
h. other (please list) _____	1	2	3	4	5

_____

_____

<u>DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA</u>

Type of School ___A ___B ___C ___D ___Vocational Center

Type of Setting ___Urban ___Suburban ___Rural

Consumer Resources and Technology

Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-5067
616 387-3704

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

December 19, 1990

Dear Coordinator:

I need your help. Western Michigan University in conjunction with the Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service, is conducting a survey of cooperative education students. You and your cooperative education program were chosen to represent a particular school setting (i.e., metropolitan core, urban fringe, city, town, rural) where cooperative education students are enrolled.

By having your students complete the enclosed surveys, you will be providing valuable information about the reasons and the sources of information which influenced students to enroll in a cooperative education program. The results will then be used to help the state Department of Education develop a statewide marketing plan for cooperative education.

The directions for the survey are simple. Please have your co-op students complete both sides of the enclosed survey questionnaire by using a #2 scoring pencil. Be sure to tell the students that they should be honest in their answers. There are no right or wrong answers. All individual responses will be confidential and only collective data will be used in the final report. You should send the complete surveys and survey transmittal sheet in the stamped self-addressed envelope and return it by January 18, 1991.

Thank you in advance for your help and assistance.

Sincerely,

Carl A. Woloszyk, Ph.D.
Associate Professor/Principal Investigator

Enclosures

INSTRUCTOR_____ COURSE NUMBER_____ SECTION____

USE NUMBER 2 PENCIL TO COMPLETELY FILL THE RESPONSE CIRCLE
EXAMPLE: ①②●④⑤

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION STUDENT SURVEY

We are contacting you as a student, to ask your help in improving the Cooperative Education Program you are currently taking at your school. There are no right or wrong answers. Each survey will be confidential and only collective data will be reported. By answering a few questions about the reasons you decided to take cooperative education, you can help us to make cooperative education programs better for students in the future. We are counting on your help. Thank you very much.

1. What is your sex? 1. Male 2. Female — 1.

2. What is your present grade in school? 1. 9th 2. 10th 3. 11th 4. 12th 5. H.S. graduate — 2.

3. What is your cumulative grade point average (GPA)?
1. 0.0-0.9 2. 1.0-1.9 3. 2.0-2.9 4. 3.0-3.49 5. 3.50-4.00 — 3.

4. Please identify yourself as a member of one of these groups of people. 1. American Indian or Alaska Native 2. Asian or Pacific Islander 3. Black, not of Hispanic Origin 4. Hispanic 5. White, not of Hispanic origin. — 4.

5. Which occupational area are you now enrolled in?
1. Business and Office (i.e. Accounting, Data Processing, Secretarial)
2. Health (i.e. Dental/Medical Assisting, Health Occupations)
3. Home Economics—Wage-Earning (i.e. Child Care, Food Management)
4. Marketing (i.e. Sales, Retailing)
5. Trade and Industrial (i.e. Auto Mechanics, Electronics, Graphics, Machine Tool, Welding) — 5.

6. About how many hours per week do you work? 1. Less than 15 hours/wk. 2. 15-19 hours/wk. 3. 20-24 hours/wk. 4. 25-29 hours/wk. 5. 30 or more hours/wk. — 6.

7. On your present job, how much are you paid?
1. $0-$3.49 2. $3.50-$3.99 3. $4.00-$4.49 4. $4.50-$4.99 5. $5.00 or more — 7.

8. When did you first decide to enroll in cooperative education? 1. During the 9th grade 2. During the 10th grade 3. During the 11th grade 4. During the 12th grade 5. After H.S. graduation. — 8.

Remember when you decided to enroll in cooperative education. Think about why you decided to sign up for co-op. For Questions 9-43 rate each question by marking the scale from 1 to 5 to the right of each statement.
1. "Strongly Disagree"
2. "Disagree"
3. "Somewhat Agree"
4. "Agree"
5. "Strongly Agree"

9. My brother(s) sister(s) took co-op. — 9.

10. My employer wanted me to take it. — 10.

11. My co-op coordinator suggested it to me. — 11.

12. My parent(s)/guardian(s) wanted me to take it. — 12.

13. My school counselor suggested it to me. — 13.

14. My friends took it. — 14.

15. Other school teachers (besides the coordinator & counselor) suggested it to me. — 15.

16. Other relatives (aunts, uncles, cousins) suggested it to me. — 16.

17. I heard a class presentation by a co-op coordinator. — 17.

18. I heard a radio or TV advertisement about co-op. — 18.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SIDE 2

19. I had an interview with a co-op coordinator.	19. 26	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
20. I read a brochure/handout/flyer about cooperative education.	20. 27	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
21. I read a bulletin board about cooperative education.	21. 28	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
22. I read a course description about cooperative education.	22. 29	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
23. I read about cooperative education in a local (community) newspaper.	23. 30	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
24. I read about cooperative education in our school newspaper.	24. 31	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
25. I read a letter about cooperative education which was sent to my parent(s)/guardian(s).	25. 32	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
26. I saw an audio/visual program/presentation about cooperative education.	26. 33	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
27. I went to a meeting to learn about cooperative education.	27. 34	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
28. I went on a field trip/visitation to another school to learn about cooperative education.	28. 35	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
29. I wanted to acquire vocational skills related to a future career.	29. 36	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
30. I wanted to learn how to apply for, get and keep a job.	30. 37	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
31. I wanted to combine classroom/laboratory theory with practical work experience.	31. 38	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
32. I wanted to develop problem-solving skills.	32. 39	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
33. I wanted to develop self-confidence, self-discipline & responsibility.	33. 40	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
34. I wanted to earn school credit toward graduation.	34. 41	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
35. I wanted to earn money while attending school.	35. 42	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
36. I wanted to enhance my job opportunities after graduation.	36. 43	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
37. I wanted to help pay for college expenses.	37. 44	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
38. I wanted to learn more about an occupational area.	38. 45	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
39. I wanted to work in a school-supervised training program.	39. 46	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
40. I wanted to get out of school early.	40. 47	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
41. I wanted a better job than I could get on my own.	41. 48	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
42. I wanted to improve my chances of getting into college.	42. 49	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
43. I wanted to enroll in an easy class.	43. 50	① ② ③ ④ ⑤

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SURVEY TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DIRECTIONS:

Please return this survey transmittal sheet and completed or unused student surveys in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by January 18, 1991 to the following address:

Carl A. Woloszyk, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Western Michigan University
1009 Trimpe Building
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-5041

Name of Instructor M. L. BRAUN

Name of School SWARTZ CREEK H.S.

Please indicate if you would like a copy of the final report mailed to you.

_X_ Yes, I would like a copy.

_____ No, it is not necessary to send a copy.

General comments about the survey: Interesting - look forward to seeing results

P.S. Thanks for your commitment to the improvement of cooperative education in Michigan!

Consumer Resources and Technology

Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-5067
616 387-3704

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

January 29, 1991

Jackie Scheller
Hartland High School
P.O. Box 900
Hartland, MI 48029

Dear Jackie Scheller:

Thank you for having your students complete the cooperative education surveys which were recently sent to your school.

The results of all the completed surveys in our sample will be tabulated and used to help the state Department of Education develop a statewide marketing plan for cooperative education.

The results and the final report will be made available to you in the near future. Thank you for your interest and support of cooperative education in Michigan.

Sincerely,

Carl A. Woloszyk, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

jm

Consumer Resources and Technology

Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-5067
616 387-3704

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

January 29, 1991

Mr. Harrison Duke
Detroit Mumford High School
17525 Wyoming
Detroit, MI 48221

Dear Mr. Duke:

In December you were sent a packet of surveys relating to cooperative education. As of this date, I have not yet received your students' completed responses to the survey.

Your assistance is very important. By having your students complete the surveys, you will be providing valuable information about the reasons and the sources of information which influenced students to enroll in cooperative education. The results will be used to help the state Department of Education develop a statewide marketing and recruitment plan for cooperative education.

Please take the time to survey your students and return the completed surveys in the previously sent self-addressed envelope.

Your support in this research effort is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Carl A. Woloszyk, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

jm

Appendix B

SIBS by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

SIBS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		38	29	52	58	46	223
		84.4	87.9	81.3	78.4	80.7	81.7
1 Agree		7	4	12	16	11	50
		15.6	12.1	18.8	21.6	19.3	18.3
Column Total		45	33	64	74	57	273
		16.5	12.1	23.4	27.1	20.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.66099	4	.79779
Likelihood Ratio	1.73789	4	.78382
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.87369	1	.34993

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.044

Number of Missing Observations: 9

EMPLOYER by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

EMPLOYER	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		37	12	47	52	43	191
		82.2	36.4	73.4	69.3	74.1	69.5
1 Agree		8	21	17	23	15	84
		17.8	63.6	26.6	30.7	25.9	30.5
	Column Total	45	33	64	75	58	275
		16.4	12.0	23.3	27.3	21.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	21.56918	4	.00024
Likelihood Ratio	20.23428	4	.00045
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.21244	1	.64486

Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.080

Number of Missing Observations: 7

COORD by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

COORD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		27	6	35	24	28	120
		58.7	18.2	54.7	32.4	49.1	43.8
1 Agree		19	27	29	50	29	154
		41.3	81.8	45.3	67.6	50.9	56.2
	Column Total	46	33	64	74	57	274
		16.8	12.0	23.4	27.0	20.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.56784	4	.00039
Likelihood Ratio	21.53696	4	.00025
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.46234	1	.49653

Minimum Expected Frequency - 14.453

Number of Missing Observations: 8

PARENTS by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

PARENTS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		25 / 55.6	11 / 33.3	34 / 53.1	38 / 50.7	22 / 38.6	130 / 47.4
1 Agree		20 / 44.4	22 / 66.7	30 / 46.9	37 / 49.3	35 / 61.4	144 / 52.6
	Column Total	45 / 16.4	33 / 12.0	64 / 23.4	75 / 27.4	57 / 20.8	274 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.75277	4	.14954
Likelihood Ratio	6.83351	4	.14495
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.84995	1	.35657

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.657

Number of Missing Observations: 8

COUNSELR by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

COUNSELR	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		35	18	40	40	32	165
		76.1	54.5	62.5	54.8	56.1	60.4
1 Agree		11	15	24	33	25	108
		23.9	45.5	37.5	45.2	43.9	39.6
	Column Total	46	33	64	73	57	273
		16.8	12.1	23.4	26.7	20.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.71707	4	.15162
Likelihood Ratio	7.02341	4	.13466
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.81267	1	.05087

Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.055

Number of Missing Observations: 9

FRIENDS by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

FRIENDS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		27	12	21	35	22	117
		58.7	37.5	32.8	46.7	38.6	42.7
1 Agree		19	20	43	40	35	157
		41.3	62.5	67.2	53.3	61.4	57.3
Column Total		46	32	64	75	57	274
		16.8	11.7	23.4	27.4	20.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.59583	4	.07204
Likelihood Ratio	8.60315	4	.07182
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.76062	1	.18455

Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.664

Number of Missing Observations: 8

TEACHER by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

TEACHER	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		43	20	50	54	32	199
		95.6	60.6	78.1	74.0	56.1	73.2
1 Agree		2	13	14	19	25	73
		4.4	39.4	21.9	26.0	43.9	26.8
Column Total		45	33	64	73	57	272
		16.5	12.1	23.5	26.8	21.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	23.38034	4	.00011
Likelihood Ratio	26.69237	4	.00002
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	12.33271	1	.00045

Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.857

Number of Missing Observations: 10

RELATIVE by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

RELATIVE	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		42	27	56	63	43	231
		93.3	84.4	87.5	86.3	75.4	85.2
1 Agree		3	5	8	10	14	40
		6.7	15.6	12.5	13.7	24.6	14.8
Column Total		45	32	64	73	57	271
		16.6	11.8	23.6	26.9	21.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.03929	4	.13383
Likelihood Ratio	6.96182	4	.13792
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	4.82325	1	.02808

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.723
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 OF 10 (10.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 11

PRESENT by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

PRESENT	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		39	22	49	62	40	212
		86.7	66.7	76.6	84.9	70.2	77.9
1 Agree		6	11	15	11	17	60
		13.3	33.3	23.4	15.1	29.8	22.1
Column Total		45	33	64	73	57	272
		16.5	12.1	23.5	26.8	21.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.57742	4	.07258
Likelihood Ratio	8.63766	4	.07082
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.72163	1	.39561

Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.279

Number of Missing Observations: 10

TV by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

TV	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		45	29	58	70	50	252
		100.0	90.6	92.1	95.9	87.7	93.3
1 Agree			3	5	3	7	18
			9.4	7.9	4.1	12.3	6.7
	Column Total	45	32	63	73	57	270
		16.7	11.9	23.3	27.0	21.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.40912	4	.11578
Likelihood Ratio	9.93187	4	.04159
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.00838	1	.08284

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.133
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 5 OF 10 (50.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 12

INTCOORD by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

INTCOORD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		33	15	19	35	24	126
		73.3	45.5	29.7	47.3	41.4	46.0
1 Agree		12	18	45	39	34	148
		26.7	54.5	70.3	52.7	58.6	54.0
Column Total		45	33	64	74	58	274
		16.4	12.0	23.4	27.0	21.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.94418	4	.00032
Likelihood Ratio	21.51887	4	.00025
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.62426	1	.01006

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.175

Number of Missing Observations: 8

FLYER by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

FLYER	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		40	24	51	63	47	225
		88.9	72.7	78.5	85.1	81.0	81.8
1 Agree		5	9	14	11	11	50
		11.1	27.3	21.5	14.9	19.0	18.2
	Column Total	45	33	65	74	58	275
		16.4	12.0	23.6	26.9	21.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.40923	4	.35345
Likelihood Ratio	4.42156	4	.35195
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.04405	1	.83377

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.000

Number of Missing Observations: 7

BULLBRD by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

BULLBRD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		40	27	49	54	40	210
		88.9	81.8	75.4	73.0	70.2	76.6
1 Agree		5	6	16	20	17	64
		11.1	18.2	24.6	27.0	29.8	23.4
	Column Total	45	33	65	74	57	274
		16.4	12.0	23.7	27.0	20.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.20942	4	.18404
Likelihood Ratio	6.80451	4	.14659
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	5.80023	1	.01602

Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.708

Number of Missing Observations: 8

DESCRIP by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

DESCRIP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		36	19	39	49	33	176
		80.0	57.6	60.0	67.1	57.9	64.5
1 Agree		9	14	26	24	24	97
		20.0	42.4	40.0	32.9	42.1	35.5
Column Total		45	33	65	73	57	273
		16.5	12.1	23.8	26.7	20.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.28992	4	.12134
Likelihood Ratio	7.69849	4	.10327
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.59678	1	.10708

Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.725

Number of Missing Observations: 9

LOCNEWSP by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

LOCNEWSP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Co Row Total
0 Disagree		42	32	58	67	50	249
		95.5	97.0	89.2	91.8	87.7	91.5
1 Agree		2	1	7	6	7	23
		4.5	3.0	10.8	8.2	12.3	8.5
Column Total		44	33	65	73	57	272
		16.2	12.1	23.9	26.8	21.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.65599	4	.45456
Likelihood Ratio	4.04163	4	.40040
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.31163	1	.12841

Minimum Expected Frequency - 2.790
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 3 OF 10 (30.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 10

SCHNEWSP by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

SCHNEWSP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		41 / 91.1	28 / 84.8	53 / 81.5	65 / 89.0	45 / 78.9	232 / 85.0
1 Agree		4 / 8.9	5 / 15.2	12 / 18.5	8 / 11.0	12 / 21.1	41 / 15.0
	Column Total	45 / 16.5	33 / 12.1	65 / 23.8	73 / 26.7	57 / 20.9	273 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.49771	4	.34282
Likelihood Ratio	4.58677	4	.33238
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.37890	1	.24029

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.956
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 OF 10 (10.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 9

LETTER by GROUP

GROUP Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
LETTER 0 Disagree	43	25	53	67	47	235
	95.6	75.8	81.5	91.8	82.5	86.1
1 Agree	2	8	12	6	10	38
	4.4	24.2	18.5	8.2	17.5	13.9
Column Total	45	33	65	73	57	273
	16.5	12.1	23.8	26.7	20.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	10.03034	4	.03992
Likelihood Ratio	10.79032	4	.02902
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.43200	1	.51101

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.593
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 OF 10 (10.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 9

AUDIVISU by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

AUDIVISU	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		45	30	55	68	41	239
		100.0	90.9	84.6	93.2	71.9	87.5
1 Agree			3	10	5	16	34
			9.1	15.4	6.8	28.1	12.5
Column Total		45	33	65	73	57	273
		16.5	12.1	23.8	26.7	20.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	22.10786	4	.00019
Likelihood Ratio	25.17978	4	.00005
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	12.40745	1	.00043

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.110
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 OF 10 (10.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 9

MEETING by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

MEETING	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		37	27	50	67	43	224
		82.2	81.8	76.9	91.8	75.4	82.1
1 Agree		8	6	15	6	14	49
		17.8	18.2	23.1	8.2	24.6	17.9
Column Total		45	33	65	73	57	273
		16.5	12.1	23.8	26.7	20.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.54759	4	.10963
Likelihood Ratio	8.28723	4	.08161
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00357	1	.95239

Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.923

Number of Missing Observations: 9

FIELDTRP by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

FIELDTRP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		44	32	58	67	45	246
		97.8	97.0	89.2	91.8	78.9	90.1
1 Agree		1	1	7	6	12	27
		2.2	3.0	10.8	8.2	21.1	9.9
Column Total		45	33	65	73	57	273
		16.5	12.1	23.8	26.7	20.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.96581	4	.01144
Likelihood Ratio	13.05612	4	.01100
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	9.57260	1	.00197

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.264
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 2 OF 10 (20.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 9

VOCSKILS by GROUP

GROUP Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
VOCSKILS 0 Disagree	14 / 31.1	7 / 21.2	11 / 16.9	17 / 23.6	12 / 21.1	61 / 22.4
1 Agree	31 / 68.9	26 / 78.8	54 / 83.1	55 / 76.4	45 / 78.9	211 / 77.6
Column Total	45 / 16.5	33 / 12.1	65 / 23.9	72 / 26.5	57 / 21.0	272 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.23044	4	.52003
Likelihood Ratio	3.16018	4	.53139
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.75924	1	.38357

Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.401

Number of Missing Observations: 10

GETJOB by GROUP

	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
GETJOB							
Disagree	0	15	7	17	24	7	70
		33.3	21.2	26.2	32.9	12.5	25.7
Agree	1	30	26	48	49	49	202
		66.7	78.8	73.8	67.1	87.5	74.3
	Column Total	45	33	65	73	56	272
		16.5	12.1	23.9	26.8	20.6	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.79911	4	.06632
Likelihood Ratio	9.46867	4	.05039
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.35151	1	.12516

Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.493

Number of Missing Observations: 10

LABTHRY by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

LABTHRY	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		19	9	14	32	9	83
		41.3	27.3	21.9	43.2	15.8	30.3
1 Agree		27	24	50	42	48	191
		58.7	72.7	78.1	56.8	84.2	69.7
	Column Total	46	33	64	74	57	274
		16.8	12.0	23.4	27.0	20.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	16.48720	4	.00243
Likelihood Ratio	16.86028	4	.00206
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.41943	1	.11984

Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.996

Number of Missing Observations: 8

PRBLMSOL by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

PRBLMSOL	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		21	10	24	34	11	100
		46.7	30.3	36.9	45.9	19.3	36.5
1 Agree		24	23	41	40	46	174
		53.3	69.7	63.1	54.1	80.7	63.5
Column Total		45	33	65	74	57	274
		16.4	12.0	23.7	27.0	20.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.68491	4	.01292
Likelihood Ratio	13.31201	4	.00985
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.34725	1	.06732

Minimum Expected Frequency - 12.044

Number of Missing Observations: 8

SELFCONF by GROUP

GROUP Page 1 of 1

SELFCONF	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		15	3	15	14	5	52
		33.3	9.1	23.1	18.7	8.8	18.9
1 Agree		30	30	50	61	52	223
		66.7	90.9	76.9	81.3	91.2	81.1
	Column Total	45	33	65	75	57	275
		16.4	12.0	23.6	27.3	20.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.73983	4	.01262
Likelihood Ratio	12.99024	4	.01132
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	5.99425	1	.01435

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.240

Number of Missing Observations: 7

CREDIT by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
CREDIT							
0 Disagree		19 / 41.3	3 / 9.1	5 / 7.7	13 / 17.3	8 / 14.0	48 / 17.4
1 Agree		27 / 58.7	30 / 90.9	60 / 92.3	62 / 82.7	49 / 86.0	228 / 82.6
	Column Total	46 / 16.7	33 / 12.0	65 / 23.6	75 / 27.2	57 / 20.7	276 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	24.59490	4	.00006
Likelihood Ratio	21.90437	4	.00021
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	7.34522	1	.00672

Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.739

Number of Missing Observations: 6

MONEY by GROUP

GROUP , Page 1 of 1

MONEY	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		14	3	4	7	4	32
		30.4	9.1	6.2	9.3	7.0	11.6
1 Agree		32	30	61	68	53	244
		69.6	90.9	93.8	90.7	93.0	88.4
	Column Total	46	33	65	75	57	276
		16.7	12.0	23.6	27.2	20.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	19.54782	4	.00061
Likelihood Ratio	15.84845	4	.00323
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	10.55500	1	.00116

Minimum Expected Frequency - 3.826
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 OF 10 (10.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 6

JOBOPP by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

JOBOPP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities Fringe 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		13	2	6	16	3	40
		28.9	6.1	9.2	21.3	5.3	14.5
1 Agree		32	31	59	59	54	235
		71.1	93.9	90.8	78.7	94.7	85.5
	Column Total	45	33	65	75	57	275
		16.4	12.0	23.6	27.3	20.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	17.56801	4	.00150
Likelihood Ratio	17.63835	4	.00145
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.90028	1	.04828

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.800
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 OF 10 (10.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 7

COLLEXP by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

COLLEXP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		25	13	17	22	11	88
		54.3	39.4	26.2	30.6	20.4	32.6
1 Agree		21	20	48	50	43	182
		45.7	60.6	73.8	69.4	79.6	67.4
	Column Total	46	33	65	72	54	270
		17.0	12.2	24.1	26.7	20.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	15.63874	4	.00354
Likelihood Ratio	15.27443	4	.00416
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	12.52209	1	.00040

Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.756

Number of Missing Observations: 12

OCCAREA by GROUP

OCCAREA	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		17	7	13	23	6	66
		37.8	21.2	20.0	31.9	11.1	24.5
1 Agree		28	26	52	49	48	203
		62.2	78.8	80.0	68.1	88.9	75.5
Column Total		45	33	65	72	54	269
		16.7	12.3	24.2	26.8	20.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.57136	4	.01357
Likelihood Ratio	13.05104	4	.01103
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	4.39563	1	.03603

Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.097

Number of Missing Observations: 13

PROGRAM by GROUP

GROUP Page 1 of 1

PROGRAM	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		26	11	32	40	16	125
		57.8	33.3	49.2	57.1	30.2	47.0
1 Agree		19	22	33	30	37	141
		42.2	66.7	50.8	42.9	69.8	53.0
	Column Total	45	33	65	70	53	266
		16.9	12.4	24.4	26.3	19.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	13.60709	4	.00866
Likelihood Ratio	13.87040	4	.00772
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.08873	1	.14839

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.508

Number of Missing Observations: 16

EARLY by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

EARLY	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		31	20	29	33	28	141
		67.4	60.6	44.6	45.8	51.9	52.2
1 Agree		15	13	36	39	26	129
		32.6	39.4	55.4	54.2	48.1	47.8
	Column Total	46	33	65	72	54	270
		17.0	12.2	24.1	26.7	20.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.86018	4	.09684
Likelihood Ratio	7.97591	4	.09246
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.81564	1	.05078

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.767

Number of Missing Observations: 12

GOODJOB by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

GOODJOB	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		28	10	33	34	17	122
		62.2	30.3	50.8	47.2	31.5	45.4
1 Agree		17	23	32	38	37	147
		37.8	69.7	49.2	52.8	68.5	54.6
Column Total		45	33	65	72	54	269
		16.7	12.3	24.2	26.8	20.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	13.24610	4	.01013
Likelihood Ratio	13.47673	4	.00917
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	4.67729	1	.03056

Minimum Expected Frequency - 14.967

Number of Missing Observations: 13

CHANCES by GROUP

Page 1 of 1

CHANCES	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	GROUP Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		21 / 46.7	9 / 27.3	17 / 26.6	19 / 26.4	12 / 22.2	78 / 29.1
1 Agree		24 / 53.3	24 / 72.7	47 / 73.4	53 / 73.6	42 / 77.8	190 / 70.9
	Column Total	45 / 16.8	33 / 12.3	64 / 23.9	72 / 26.9	54 / 20.1	268 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.47753	4	.07557
Likelihood Ratio	7.99486	4	.09177
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	5.97172	1	.01454

Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.604

Number of Missing Observations: 14

EASYCLAS by GROUP

GROUP Page 1 of 1

EASYCLAS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Rural 1	Town 2	Urban Fringe 3	Fr Cities 4	Metro Core 5	Row Total
0 Disagree		43	25	52	53	40	213
		93.5	75.8	80.0	74.6	74.1	79.2
1 Agree		3	8	13	18	14	56
		6.5	24.2	20.0	25.4	25.9	20.8
Column Total		46	33	65	71	54	269
		17.1	12.3	24.2	26.4	20.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.70482	4	.10301
Likelihood Ratio	9.21527	4	.05594
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	5.28102	1	.02156

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.870

Number of Missing Observations: 13

Appendix C

SIBS by RACE

SIBS	RACE Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		66	155	221
		79.5	82.4	81.5
1 Agree		17	33	50
		20.5	17.6	18.5
Column Total		83	188	271
		30.6	69.4	100.0

Page 1 of 1

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.32825	1	.56669
Continuity Correction	.16245	1	.68691
Likelihood Ratio	.32343	1	.56955
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.32704	1	.56741

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.314

Number of Missing Observations: 11

EMPLOYER by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

EMPLOYER	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-white	White	Row Total
0 Disagree		63	127	190
		75.0	67.2	69.6
1 Agree		21	62	83
		25.0	32.8	30.4
Column Total		84	189	273
		30.8	69.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.67391	1	.19574
Continuity Correction	1.32540	1	.24963
Likelihood Ratio	1.71041	1	.19093
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.66778	1	.19656

Minimum Expected Frequency - 25.538

Number of Missing Observations: 9

COORD by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

COORD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		34	84	118
		41.0	44.4	43.4
1 Agree		49	105	154
		59.0	55.6	56.6
Column Total		83	189	272
		30.5	69.5	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.28445	1	.59380
Continuity Correction	.16040	1	.68879
Likelihood Ratio	.28525	1	.59328
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.28341	1	.59448

Minimum Expected Frequency - 36.007

Number of Missing Observations: 10

PARENTS by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

PARENTS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-white (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		35	94	129
		42.7	49.5	47.4
1 Agree		47	96	143
		57.3	50.5	52.6
Column Total		82	190	272
		30.1	69.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.05937	1	.30336
Continuity Correction	.80452	1	.36975
Likelihood Ratio	1.06257	1	.30263
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.05547	1	.30425

Minimum Expected Frequency - 38.890

Number of Missing Observations: 10

COUNSELR by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

COUNSELR	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		52	112	164
		63.4	59.3	60.5
1 Agree		30	77	107
		36.6	40.7	39.5
Column Total		82	189	271
		30.3	69.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.41327	1	.52031
Continuity Correction	.25766	1	.61173
Likelihood Ratio	.41547	1	.51920
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.41175	1	.52108

Minimum Expected Frequency - 32.376

Number of Missing Observations: 11

FRIENDS by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
FRIENDS 0 Disagree	37 / 45.1	79 / 41.6	116 / 42.6
1 Agree	45 / 54.9	111 / 58.4	156 / 57.4
Column Total	82 / 30.1	190 / 69.9	272 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.29397	1	.58769
Continuity Correction	.16696	1	.68283
Likelihood Ratio	.29323	1	.58816
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.29289	1	.58838

Minimum Expected Frequency - 34.971

Number of Missing Observations: 10

TEACHER by RACE

	RACE		Page 1 of 1
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
TEACHER			
0 Disagree	56 / 68.3	142 / 75.5	198 / 73.3
1 Agree	26 / 31.7	46 / 24.5	72 / 26.7
Column Total	82 / 30.4	188 / 69.6	270 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.53011	1	.21610
Continuity Correction	1.18231	1	.27689
Likelihood Ratio	1.50035	1	.22062
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.52444	1	.21695

Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.867

Number of Missing Observations: 12

RELATIVE by RACE

Page 1 of 1

RELATIVE	RACE: Non-white	RACE: White	Row Total
0 Disagree	65	165	230
	79.3	88.2	85.5
1 Agree	17	22	39
	20.7	11.8	14.5
Column Total	82	187	269
	30.5	69.5	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.69751	1	.05449
Continuity Correction	3.00952	1	.08278
Likelihood Ratio	3.51132	1	.06095
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.68377	1	.05494

Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.888

Number of Missing Observations: 13

PRESENT by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

PRESENT	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-white (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		58	152	210
		70.7	80.9	77.8
1 Agree		24	36	60
		29.3	19.1	22.2
Column Total		82	188	270
		30.4	69.6	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.38276	1	.06588
Continuity Correction	2.82261	1	.09295
Likelihood Ratio	3.26820	1	.07064
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.37023	1	.06638

Minimum Expected Frequency - 18.222

Number of Missing Observations: 12

TV by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

TV	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		76	174	250
		92.7	93.5	93.3
1 Agree		6	12	18
		7.3	6.5	6.7
Column Total		82	186	268
		30.6	69.4	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.06804	1	.79422
Continuity Correction	.00000	1	1.00000
Likelihood Ratio	.06705	1	.79568
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.06778	1	.79459

Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.507

Number of Missing Observations: 14

INTCOORD by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

INTCOORD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		35	90	125
		41.2	48.1	46.0
1 Agree		50	97	147
		58.8	51.9	54.0
Column Total		85	187	272
		31.3	68.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.13712	1	.28626
Continuity Correction	.87444	1	.34973
Likelihood Ratio	1.14170	1	.28529
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.13294	1	.28715

Minimum Expected Frequency - 39.063

Number of Missing Observations: 10

FLYER by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
FLYER 0 Disagree	66	157	223
	77.6	83.5	81.7
1 Agree	19	31	50
	22.4	16.5	18.3
Column Total	85	188	273
	31.1	68.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.34521	1	.24612
Continuity Correction	.98182	1	.32175
Likelihood Ratio	1.30929	1	.25252
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.34028	1	.24698

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.568

Number of Missing Observations: 9

BULLBRD by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

BULLBRD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		62	146	208
		73.8	77.7	76.5
1 Agree		22	42	64
		26.2	22.3	23.5
Column Total		84	188	272
		30.9	69.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.47829	1	.48920
Continuity Correction	.28825	1	.59134
Likelihood Ratio	.47195	1	.49000
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.47654	1	.49000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 19.765

Number of Missing Observations: 10

DESCRIP by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

DESCRIP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		54	121	175
		64.3	64.7	64.6
1 Agree		30	66	96
		35.7	35.3	35.4
Column Total		84	187	271
		31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.00447	1	.94668
Continuity Correction	.00000	1	1.00000
Likelihood Ratio	.00446	1	.94676
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00446	1	.94677

Minimum Expected Frequency - 29.756

Number of Missing Observations: 11

LOCNEWSP by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

LOCNEWSP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
0 Disagree		73	175	248
		88.0	93.6	91.9
1 Agree		10	12	22
		12.0	6.4	8.1
Column Total		83	187	270
		30.7	69.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.43552	1	.11861
Continuity Correction	1.74124	1	.18698
Likelihood Ratio	2.29079	1	.13014
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.42650	1	.11930

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.763

Number of Missing Observations: 12

SCHNEWSP by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

SCHNEWSP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
0 Disagree		71	160	231
		84.5	85.6	85.2
1 Agree		13	27	40
		15.5	14.4	14.8
Column Total		84	187	271
		31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.04961	1	.82375
Continuity Correction	.00141	1	.97003
Likelihood Ratio	.04922	1	.82442
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.04942	1	.82407

Minimum Expected Frequency - 12.399

Number of Missing Observations: 11

LETTER by RACE

	RACE		Page 1 of 1
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e	White	Row Total
LETTER			
0 Disagree	73	162	235
	86.9	86.6	86.7
1 Agree	11	25	36
	13.1	13.4	13.3
Column Total	84	187	271
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.00377	1	.95104
Continuity Correction	.00000	1	1.00000
Likelihood Ratio	.00377	1	.95104
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00376	1	.95113

Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.159

Number of Missing Observations: 11

AUDIVISU by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

AUDIVISU	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-white	White	Row Total
0 Disagree		70	168	238
		83.3	89.8	87.8
1 Agree		14	19	33
		16.7	10.2	12.2
Column Total		84	187	271
		31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.29435	1	.12985
Continuity Correction	1.72629	1	.18888
Likelihood Ratio	2.18976	1	.13893
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.28588	1	.13056

Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.229

Number of Missing Observations: 11

MEETING by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

MEETING	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
0 Disagree		68 / 81.0	155 / 82.9	223 / 82.3
1 Agree		16 / 19.0	32 / 17.1	48 / 17.7
Column Total		84 / 31.0	187 / 69.0	271 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.14895	1	.69954
Continuity Correction	.04576	1	.83061
Likelihood Ratio	.14742	1	.70101
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.14840	1	.70007

Minimum Expected Frequency - 14.878

Number of Missing Observations: 11

FIELDTRP by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

FIELDTRP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
0 Disagree		70	175	245
		83.3	93.6	90.4
1 Agree		14	12	26
		16.7	6.4	9.6
Column Total		84	187	271
		31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	7.02038	1	.00806
Continuity Correction	5.88842	1	.01524
Likelihood Ratio	6.49481	1	.01082
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.99448	1	.00818

Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.059

Number of Missing Observations: 11

VOCSKILS by RACE

VOCSKILS	RACE: Non-white	RACE: White	Row Total
0 Disagree	17	44	61
	20.5	23.5	22.6
1 Agree	66	143	209
	79.5	76.5	77.4
Column Total	83	187	270
	30.7	69.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.30527	1	.58059
Continuity Correction	.15588	1	.69297
Likelihood Ratio	.30930	1	.57811
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.30414	1	.58130

Minimum Expected Frequency - 18.752

Number of Missing Observations: 12

GETJOB by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

GETJOB	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		16	54	70
		19.3	28.9	25.9
1 Agree		67	133	200
		80.7	71.1	74.1
Column Total		83	187	270
		30.7	69.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.75860	1	.09673
Continuity Correction	2.28136	1	.13094
Likelihood Ratio	2.86420	1	.09057
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.74838	1	.09735

Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.519

Number of Missing Observations: 12

LABTHRY by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
LABTHRY			
0 Disagree	22 / 26.2	61 / 32.4	83 / 30.5
1 Agree	62 / 73.8	127 / 67.6	189 / 69.5
Column Total	84 / 30.9	188 / 69.1	272 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.07178	1	.30054
Continuity Correction	.79702	1	.37199
Likelihood Ratio	1.08969	1	.29654
Martel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.06784	1	.30143

Minimum Expected Frequency - 25.632

Number of Missing Observations: 10

PRBLMSOL by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

PRBLMSOL	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		23 / 27.7	77 / 40.7	100 / 36.8
1 Agree		60 / 72.3	112 / 59.3	172 / 63.2
Column Total		83 / 30.5	189 / 69.5	272 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.21175	1	.04015
Continuity Correction	3.66993	1	.05540
Likelihood Ratio	4.32014	1	.03766
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	4.19626	1	.04051

Minimum Expected Frequency - 30.515

Number of Missing Observations: 10

SELFCONF by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

SELFCONF	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		12	40	52
		14.3	21.2	19.0
1 Agree		72	149	221
		85.7	78.8	81.0
Column Total		84	189	273
		30.8	69.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.78431	1	.18162
Continuity Correction	1.36612	1	.24248
Likelihood Ratio	1.86079	1	.17253
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.77778	1	.18242

Minimum Expected Frequency - 16.000

Number of Missing Observations: 9

CREDIT by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
CREDIT 0 Disagree	13 / 15.5	35 / 18.4	48 / 17.5
1 Agree	71 / 84.5	155 / 81.6	226 / 82.5
Column Total	84 / 30.7	190 / 69.3	274 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.34959	1	.55434
Continuity Correction	.17549	1	.67528
Likelihood Ratio	.35611	1	.55068
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.34832	1	.55507

Minimum Expected Frequency - 14.715

Number of Missing Observations: 8

MONEY by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

MONEY	Non-white (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree	9	23	32
	10.7	12.1	11.7
1 Agree	75	167	242
	89.3	87.9	88.3
Column Total	84	190	274
	30.7	69.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.10926	1	.74099
Continuity Correction	.01602	1	.89929
Likelihood Ratio	.11079	1	.73924
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.10886	1	.74144

Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.810

Number of Missing Observations: 8

JOBOPP by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

JOBOPP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-white	White	Row Total
0 Disagree		10	30	40
		11.9	15.9	14.7
1 Agree		74	159	233
		88.1	84.1	85.3
Column Total		84	189	273
		30.8	69.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.73230	1	.39214
Continuity Correction	.44935	1	.50265
Likelihood Ratio	.75644	1	.38445
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.72961	1	.39301

Minimum Expected Frequency - 12.308

Number of Missing Observations: 9

COLLEXP by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

COLLEXP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		25	63	88
		30.9	33.5	32.7
1 Agree		56	125	181
		69.1	66.5	67.3
Column Total		81	188	269
		30.1	69.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.18012	1	.67127
Continuity Correction	.07995	1	.77736
Likelihood Ratio	.18119	1	.67036
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.17945	1	.67185

Minimum Expected Frequency - 26.498

Number of Missing Observations: 13

OCCAREA by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

OCCAREA	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		15	51	66
		18.5	27.3	24.6
1 Agree		66	136	202
		81.5	72.7	75.4
Column Total		81	187	268
		30.2	69.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.33346	1	.12662
Continuity Correction	1.88567	1	.16969
Likelihood Ratio	2.42335	1	.11954
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.32475	1	.12733

Minimum Expected Frequency - 19.948

Number of Missing Observations: 14

PROGRAM by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

PROGRAM	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e 0	White 1	Row Total
0 Disagree		33 / 41.3	92 / 49.7	125 / 47.2
1 Agree		47 / 58.8	93 / 50.3	140 / 52.8
Column Total		80 / 30.2	185 / 69.8	265 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.61151	1	.20428
Continuity Correction	1.28920	1	.25620
Likelihood Ratio	1.61855	1	.20329
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.60543	1	.20514

Minimum Expected Frequency - 37.736

Number of Missing Observations: 17

EARLY by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

EARLY	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-white (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		44	97	141
		54.3	51.6	52.4
1 Agree		37	91	128
		45.7	48.4	47.6
	Column Total	81	188	269
		30.1	69.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.16857	1	.68139
Continuity Correction	.07701	1	.78139
Likelihood Ratio	.16871	1	.68126
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.16794	1	.68195

Minimum Expected Frequency - 38.543

Number of Missing Observations: 13

GOODJOB by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

GOODJOB	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit e (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		31	91	122
		38.3	48.7	45.5
1 Agree		50	96	146
		61.7	51.3	54.5
Column Total		81	187	268
		30.2	69.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.46096	1	.11671
Continuity Correction	2.05978	1	.15123
Likelihood Ratio	2.48017	1	.11529
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.45178	1	.11739

Minimum Expected Frequency - 36.873

Number of Missing Observations: 14

CHANCES by RACE

Page 1 of 1

CHANCES	RACE: Non-white (0)	RACE: White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree	23	55	78
	28.4	29.6	29.2
1 Agree	58	131	189
	71.6	70.4	70.8
Column Total	81	186	267
	30.3	69.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.03766	1	.84612
Continuity Correction	.00227	1	.96196
Likelihood Ratio	.03778	1	.84588
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.03752	1	.84641

Minimum Expected Frequency - 23.663

Number of Missing Observations: 15

EASYCLAS by RACE

RACE Page 1 of 1

EASYCLAS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Non-whit (0)	White (1)	Row Total
0 Disagree		65	148	213
		80.2	79.1	79.5
1 Agree		16	39	55
		19.8	20.9	20.5
Column Total		81	187	268
		30.2	69.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.04212	1	.83739
Continuity Correction	.00164	1	.96765
Likelihood Ratio	.04233	1	.83700
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.04196	1	.83769

Minimum Expected Frequency - 16.623

Number of Missing Observations: 14

Appendix D

SIBS by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

SIBS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male (1)	Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		71	140	211
		87.7	78.2	81.2
1 Agree		10	39	49
		12.3	21.8	18.8
Column Total		81	179	260
		31.2	68.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.25060	1	.07140
Continuity Correction	2.66256	1	.10274
Likelihood Ratio	3.45696	1	.06299
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.23810	1	.07194

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.265

Number of Missing Observations: 22

EMPLOYER by SEX

Page 1 of 1

EMPLOYER	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		55	128	183
		67.9	70.7	69.8
1 Agree		26	53	79
		32.1	29.3	30.2
Column Total		81	181	262
		30.9	69.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.21084	1	.64611
Continuity Correction	.09830	1	.75388
Likelihood Ratio	.20950	1	.64716
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.21004	1	.64674

Minimum Expected Frequency - 24.424

Number of Missing Observations: 20

COORD by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male	Female	Row Total
	1	2	
COORD			
0	35	75	110
Disagree	43.2	41.7	42.1
1	46	105	151
Agree	56.8	58.3	57.9
Column Total	81	180	261
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.05456	1	.81531
Continuity Correction	.00962	1	.92185
Likelihood Ratio	.05449	1	.81542
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.05435	1	.81566

Minimum Expected Frequency - 34.138

Number of Missing Observations: 21

PARENTS by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

PARENTS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		41	83	124
		50.0	45.9	47.1
1 Agree		41	98	139
		50.0	54.1	52.9
Column Total		82	181	263
		31.2	68.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.38885	1	.53291
Continuity Correction	.24034	1	.62396
Likelihood Ratio	.38853	1	.53307
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.38737	1	.53369

Minimum Expected Frequency - 38.662

Number of Missing Observations: 19

COUNSELR by SEX

Page 1 of 1

COUNSELR	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		45	111	156
		54.9	61.7	59.5
1 Agree		37	69	106
		45.1	38.3	40.5
	Column Total	82	180	262
		31.3	68.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.07775	1	.29920
Continuity Correction	.81437	1	.36683
Likelihood Ratio	1.07189	1	.30052
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.07364	1	.30012

Minimum Expected Frequency - 33.176

Number of Missing Observations: 20

FRIENDS by SEX

Page 1 of 1

FRIENDS	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		33	79	112
		40.7	43.4	42.6
1 Agree		48	103	151
		59.3	56.6	57.4
	Column Total	81	182	263
		30.8	69.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.16293	1	.68648
Continuity Correction	.07214	1	.78825
Likelihood Ratio	.16330	1	.68614
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.16231	1	.68704

Minimum Expected Frequency - 34.494

Number of Missing Observations: 19

TEACHER by SEX

TEACHER	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree	54	138	192
	66.7	76.7	73.6
1 Agree	27	42	69
	33.3	23.3	26.4
Column Total	81	180	261
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.87242	1	.09011
Continuity Correction	2.38123	1	.12280
Likelihood Ratio	2.80125	1	.09419
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.86141	1	.09073

Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.414

Number of Missing Observations: 21

RELATIVE by SEX

Page 1 of 1

RELATIVE	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		69	155	224
		86.3	86.1	86.2
1 Agree		11	25	36
		13.8	13.9	13.8
Column Total		80	180	260
		30.8	69.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.00090	1	.97613
Continuity Correction	.00000	1	1.00000
Likelihood Ratio	.00089	1	.97616
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00089	1	.97617

Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.077

Number of Missing Observations: 22

PRESENT by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male (1)	Female (2)	Row Total
PRESENT 0 Disagree	62	142	204
	76.5	78.9	78.2
1 Agree	19	38	57
	23.5	21.1	21.8
Column Total	81	180	261
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.18007	1	.67132
Continuity Correction	.06887	1	.79300
Likelihood Ratio	.17839	1	.67276
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.17938	1	.67191

Minimum Expected Frequency - 17.690

Number of Missing Observations: 21

TV by SEX

Page 1 of 1

TV	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		71	173	244
		88.8	96.6	94.2
1 Agree		9	6	15
		11.3	3.4	5.8
	Column Total	80	179	259
		30.9	69.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.32122	1	.01193
Continuity Correction	4.95653	1	.02599
Likelihood Ratio	5.75954	1	.01640
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.29681	1	.01210
Fisher's Exact Test:			
One-Tail			.01575
Two-Tail			.01899

Minimum Expected Frequency - 4.633
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 1 OF 4 (25.0%)

Number of Missing Observations: 23

INTCOORD by SEX

Page 1 of 1

INTCOORD	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree	35	81	116
	43.2	45.0	44.4
1 Agree	46	99	145
	56.8	55.0	55.6
Column Total	81	180	261
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.07250	1	.78773
Continuity Correction	.01813	1	.89291
Likelihood Ratio	.07259	1	.78760
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.07222	1	.78813

Minimum Expected Frequency - 36.000

Number of Missing Observations: 21

FLYER by SEX

		SEX	
	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male	Female
		1	2
FLYER			
0 Disagree		65	150
		80.2	82.9
1 Agree		16	31
		19.8	17.1
	Column Total	81	181
		30.9	69.1

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.26213	1	.60866
Continuity Correction	.11410	1	.73553
Likelihood Ratio	.25859	1	.61109
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.26113	1	.60934

Minimum Expected Frequency - 14.531

Number of Missing Observations: 20

BULLBRD by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

BULLBRD	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		61 / 75.3	142 / 78.5	203 / 77.5
1 Agree		20 / 24.7	39 / 21.5	59 / 22.5
Column Total		81 / 30.9	181 / 69.1	262 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.31710	1	.57336
Continuity Correction	.16249	1	.68688
Likelihood Ratio	.31337	1	.57562
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.31589	1	.57409

Minimum Expected Frequency - 18.240

Number of Missing Observations: 20

DESCRIP by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

DESCRIP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		54	119	173
		66.7	66.1	66.3
1 Agree		27	61	88
		33.3	33.9	33.7
Column Total		81	180	261
		31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.00771	1	.93001
Continuity Correction	.00000	1	1.00000
Likelihood Ratio	.00771	1	.93005
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00769	1	.93014

Minimum Expected Frequency - 27.310

Number of Missing Observations: 21

LOCNEWSP by SEX

LOCNEWSP	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree	73	170	243
	91.3	94.4	93.5
1 Agree	7	10	17
	8.8	5.6	6.5
Column Total	80	180	260
	30.8	69.2	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.92485	1	.33620
Continuity Correction	.47597	1	.49025
Likelihood Ratio	.88158	1	.34777
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.92129	1	.33714

Minimum Expected Frequency - 5.231

Number of Missing Observations: 22

SCHNEWSP by SEX

Page 1 of 1

SCHNEWSP	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree	62 76.5	164 91.1	226 86.6
1 Agree	19 23.5	16 8.9	35 13.4
Column Total	81 31.0	180 69.0	261 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	10.20976	1	.00140
Continuity Correction	8.99371	1	.00271
Likelihood Ratio	9.49060	1	.00207
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	10.17064	1	.00143

Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.862

Number of Missing Observations: 21

LETTER by SEX

	SEX		Page 1 of 1
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male	Female	Row Total
	1	2	
LETTER			
0 Disagree	70 / 86.4	160 / 88.9	230 / 88.1
1 Agree	11 / 13.6	20 / 11.1	31 / 11.9
Column Total	81 / 31.0	180 / 69.0	261 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.32539	1	.56839
Continuity Correction	.13224	1	.71612
Likelihood Ratio	.31866	1	.57241
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.32414	1	.56913

Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.621

Number of Missing Observations: 21

AUDIVISU by SEX

Page 1 of 1

AUDIVISU	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree	69	164	233
	85.2	91.1	89.3
1 Agree	12	16	28
	14.8	8.9	10.7
Column Total	81	180	261
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.04831	1	.15237
Continuity Correction	1.47628	1	.22436
Likelihood Ratio	1.95055	1	.16253
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.04047	1	.15316

Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.690

Number of Missing Observations: 21

MEETING by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

MEETING	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		68 84.0	151 83.9	219 83.9
1 Agree		13 16.0	29 16.1	42 16.1
Column Total		81 31.0	180 69.0	261 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.00016	1	.98998
Continuity Correction	.00000	1	1.00000
Likelihood Ratio	.00014	1	.99042
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00016	1	.99000

Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.034

Number of Missing Observations: 21

18-Apr-91 sex versus Opinion
17:01:46 WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY on PIGLET:: VMS V5.4

FIELDTRP by SEX

Page 1 of 1

FIELDTRP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		69	170	239
		85.2	94.4	91.6
1 Agree		12	10	22
		14.8	5.6	8.4
Column Total		81	180	261
		31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.20483	1	.01274
Continuity Correction	5.06321	1	.02444
Likelihood Ratio	5.72661	1	.01671
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.18106	1	.01291

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.828

Number of Missing Observations: 21

VOCSKILS by SEX

Page 1 of 1

VOCSKILS	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree	24	35	59
	29.6	19.6	22.7
1 Agree	57	144	201
	70.4	80.4	77.3
Column Total	81	179	260
	31.2	68.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.22766	1	.07240
Continuity Correction	2.67882	1	.10169
Likelihood Ratio	3.12658	1	.07703
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.21525	1	.07296

Minimum Expected Frequency - 18.381

Number of Missing Observations: 22

GETJOB by SEX

Page 1 of 1

GETJOB	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree	28	42	70
	34.6	23.5	26.9
1 Agree	53	137	190
	65.4	76.5	73.1
Column Total	81	179	260
	31.2	68.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	3.49491	1	.06156
Continuity Correction	2.95330	1	.08570
Likelihood Ratio	3.40450	1	.06502
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	3.48146	1	.06206

Minimum Expected Frequency - 21.808

Number of Missing Observations: 22

LABTHRY by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male (1)	Female (2)	Row Total
LABTHRY 0 Disagree	23	58	81
	28.4	32.0	30.9
1 Agree	58	123	181
	71.6	68.0	69.1
Column Total	81	181	262
	30.9	69.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.34888	1	.55475
Continuity Correction	.19895	1	.65557
Likelihood Ratio	.35201	1	.55298
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.34755	1	.55550

Minimum Expected Frequency - 25.042

Number of Missing Observations: 20

PRBLMSOL by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

PRBLMSOL	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		30	68	98
		36.6	37.8	37.4
1 Agree		52	112	164
		63.4	62.2	62.6
Column Total		82	180	262
		31.3	68.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.03421	1	.85326
Continuity Correction	.00224	1	.96228
Likelihood Ratio	.03429	1	.85310
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.03408	1	.85354

Minimum Expected Frequency - 30.672

Number of Missing Observations: 20

SELFCONF by SEX

Page 1 of 1

SELFCONF	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	SEX: Male (1)	SEX: Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		24	25	49
		29.3	13.8	18.6
1 Agree		58	156	214
		70.7	86.2	81.4
	Column Total	82	181	263
		31.2	68.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.89284	1	.00286
Continuity Correction	7.90252	1	.00494
Likelihood Ratio	8.41582	1	.00372
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	8.85902	1	.00292

Minimum Expected Frequency - 15.278

Number of Missing Observations: 19

CREDIT by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
CREDIT 0 Disagree	20 / 24.4	25 / 13.7	45 / 17.0
1 Agree	62 / 75.6	157 / 86.3	219 / 83.0
Column Total	82 / 31.1	182 / 68.9	264 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.53791	1	.03315
Continuity Correction	3.81573	1	.05077
Likelihood Ratio	4.32661	1	.03752
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	4.52073	1	.03349

Minimum Expected Frequency - 13.977

Number of Missing Observations: 18

MONEY by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

MONEY	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		13	16	29
		15.9	8.8	11.0
1 Agree		69	166	235
		84.1	91.2	89.0
Column Total		82	182	264
		31.1	68.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.88359	1	.08949
Continuity Correction	2.20655	1	.13743
Likelihood Ratio	2.73058	1	.09844
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.87267	1	.09010

Minimum Expected Frequency - 9.008

Number of Missing Observations: 18

JOBOPP by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

JOBOPP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		16	21	37
		19.5	11.6	14.1
1 Agree		66	160	226
		80.5	88.4	85.9
	Column Total	82	181	263
		31.2	68.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.92072	1	.08745
Continuity Correction	2.30306	1	.12912
Likelihood Ratio	2.78824	1	.09496
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.90961	1	.08805

Minimum Expected Frequency - 11.536

Number of Missing Observations: 19

COLLEXP by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

COLLEXP	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male (1)	Female (2)	Row Total
0 Disagree		29	57	86
		35.8	31.5	32.8
1 Agree		52	124	176
		64.2	68.5	67.2
	Column Total	81	181	262
		30.9	69.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.47159	1	.49226
Continuity Correction	.29635	1	.58618
Likelihood Ratio	.46791	1	.49395
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.46979	1	.49309

Minimum Expected Frequency - 26.588

Number of Missing Observations: 20

OCCAREA by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

OCCAREA	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		23	42	65
		28.4	23.3	24.9
1 Agree		58	138	196
		71.6	76.7	75.1
Column Total		81	180	261
		31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.76529	1	.38168
Continuity Correction	.51857	1	.47145
Likelihood Ratio	.75352	1	.38536
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.76236	1	.38259

Minimum Expected Frequency - 20.172

Number of Missing Observations: 21

PROGRAM by SEX

	SEX		Page 1 of 1
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male	Female	Row Total
	1	2	
PROGRAM			
0	38	85	123
Disagree	47.5	47.8	47.7
1	42	93	135
Agree	52.5	52.2	52.3
Column Total	80	178	258
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.00141	1	.97000
Continuity Correction	.00000	1	1.00000
Likelihood Ratio	.00141	1	.97001
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00141	1	.97006

Minimum Expected Frequency - 38.140

Number of Missing Observations: 24

EARLY by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

EARLY	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
Disagree	0	41	97	138
		50.6	53.6	52.7
Agree	1	40	84	124
		49.4	46.4	47.3
	Column Total	81	181	262
		30.9	69.1	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.19852	1	.65592
Continuity Correction	.09715	1	.75528
Likelihood Ratio	.19839	1	.65602
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.19776	1	.65653

Minimum Expected Frequency - 38.336

Number of Missing Observations: 20

GOODJOB by SEX

	SEX		Page 1 of 1
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male	Female	Row Total
	1	2	
GOODJOB			
0	43	77	120
Disagree	53.1	42.8	46.0
1	38	103	141
Agree	46.9	57.2	54.0
Column Total	81	180	261
	31.0	69.0	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	2.39002	1	.12211
Continuity Correction	1.99300	1	.15803
Likelihood Ratio	2.38607	1	.12242
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	2.38086	1	.12283

Minimum Expected Frequency - 37.241

Number of Missing Observations: 21

CHANCES by SEX

SEX Page 1 of 1

CHANCES	Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male 1	Female 2	Row Total
0 Disagree		28 / 35.0	49 / 27.2	77 / 29.6
1 Agree		52 / 65.0	131 / 72.8	183 / 70.4
	Column Total	80 / 30.8	180 / 69.2	260 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.60733	1	.20487
Continuity Correction	1.25585	1	.26244
Likelihood Ratio	1.58064	1	.20867
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.60115	1	.20574

Minimum Expected Frequency - 23.692

Number of Missing Observations: 22

EASYCLAS by SEX

	SEX		Page 1 of 1
Count / Col Pct / Col Pct	Male	Female	Row Total
	1	2	
EASYCLAS			
0 Disagree	65 / 81.3	143 / 79.0	208 / 79.7
1 Agree	15 / 18.8	38 / 21.0	53 / 20.3
Column Total	80 / 30.7	181 / 69.3	261 / 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	.17270	1	.67772
Continuity Correction	.06185	1	.80359
Likelihood Ratio	.17465	1	.67601
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.17204	1	.67830

Minimum Expected Frequency - 16.245

Number of Missing Observations: 21